DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 518 EC 100 107

AUTHOR Murphy, Philip J.
TITLE Oklahoma Child Service Demonstration Center Formal Final Evaluation. July 1, 1975 to June 30, 1976.
PUB DATE 76
CONTRACT 300-75-0372
NOTE 80p.; Programs for Children with Specific Learning Disabilities, P.L. 91-230, Title VI-G; For related information, see EC 100 106

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Demonstration Projects; Exceptional Child Research; *Group Counseling; Individualized Instruction; *Individualized Programs; *Learning Disabilities; Models; *Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; Secondary Education

ABSTRACT

Provided is the 1975-76 evaluation of a center providing individualized prescriptive programs for secondary-level learning disabled students. Changes in the program for the third year of operation are noted to have been an emphasis on the evaluation of the group counseling format (based on Reality Therapy and using a team of two co-facilitators) used with 69 of the students. Results of the evaluation, which are presented in tabular form, are discussed. Among the findings discussed are that there was a significant positive gain in English grades for those students involved in group counseling when compared to controls; and that work methods, teacher approval, education acceptance, study attitudes, and study orientation all showed significant gains made by the group counseling students in relation to the control students. (IM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED136518

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN WITH SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITIES

P.L. 91-230, Title VI-G

FORMAL FINAL EVALUATION

July 1, 1975, to June 30, 1976

CONTRACT NO.: 300-75-0372

PROJECT NAME: OKLAHOMA CHILD SERVICE DEMONSTRATION CENTER

PROJECT LOCATION: Route 3, Hillside School
Cushing, Oklahoma 74023

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Deborah A. Murphy
(Signature)
Deborah A. Murphy

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Philip J. Murphy
Philip J. Murphy, Ph.D.

DATE OF REPORT SUBMISSION: September 30, 1976

EC100107

FORMAL
PROGRAM EVALUATION

LIST OF CONTENTS

	Page
PROGRAM EVALUATION METHODS AND PROCEDURES	1
Subjects	1
Procedures	3
Instruments and Measures	6
Results	9
COGNITIVE DOMAIN	9
WISC-R	9
WRAT	14
Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulties	19
School Grades	23
Summary: Cognitive Domain	26
AFFECTIVE DOMAIN	27
Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes	27
Tennessee Self Concept Scale	32
Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation: Feeling and Behavior	32
Summary: Affective Domain	33
RATED IMPROVEMENT	34
Resource Room Teacher's Student Evaluation	34
Student Self Rating Questionnaire	34
Parent Questionnaire	35
Summary: Rated Improvement	35
GROUP COUNSELING	37
Cognitive Domain	37
Affective Domain	41
Rated Improvement	50
Conclusion	50
NUMBER OF STUDENTS RECEIVING DIAGNOSTIC PRESCRIPTIVE SERVICES	56
DIAGNOSTIC SCREENING AND TESTING	56
NUMBER OF PARENTS RECEIVING SERVICES	56
IN SERVICE TRAINING	58
ON-SITE VISITATIONS TO PROJECT CENTER	63
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INVOLVED IN REPLICATION ACTIVITIES	63
MATERIAL DISSEMINATION	63

LIST OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
AMOUNT OF STATE FUNDS ALLOCATED FOR LEARNING DISABILITIES PROGRAMS	66
AMOUNT OF LOCAL FUNDS ALLOCATED FOR LEARNING DISABILITIES PROGRAMS	66
SPECIAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS	66

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1	- Ethnic Distribution of Project Students	2
Table 2	- Number of Students Mainstreamed	4
Table 3	- WISC-R Pre-Post Change Scores	11
Table 4	- Comparison of 1974-76 with 1973-74 Change Scores	12
Table 5	- Comparison of 1975-76 with 1973-74 Subtest, Pre, Post and Change Scores	13
Table 6	- WRAT Pre, Post and Change Scores	16
Table 7	- WRAT Achievement Grade Level Change Scores	17
Table 8	- Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty Mean Prorated Scores	21
Table 9	- Durrell Grade Level Prorated Change Scores	22
Table 10	- English Grades	24
Table 11	- Math Grades	24
Table 12	- Science Grades	25
Table 13	- Social Studies Grades	25
Table 14	- Change in Grades in Four Subject Areas	26
Table 15	- SSHA Pre, Post and Change Scores by Town - Delay Avoidance Scales	28
Table 16	- SSHA Pre, Post and Change Scores by Town - Work Methods Scale	29
Table 17	- SSHA Pre, Post and Change Scores by Town - Study Habits Scale	29
Table 18	- SSHA Pre, Post and Change Scores by Town - Teacher Approval	30
Table 19	- SSHA Pre, Post and Change Scores by Town - Educational Acceptance	30
Table 20	- SSHA Pre, Post and Change Scores by Town - Study Attitude	31
Table 21	- SSHA Pre, Post and Change Scores by Town - Study Orientation	31
Table 22	- Comparison of SSHA Change Scores 1974-75 with 1975-76	32
Table 23	- Resource Room Teacher's Student Evaluation	34
Table 24	- Student Self Rating Questionnaire	36
Table 25	- Parent Questionnaire	36
Table 26	- WRAT Change Scores by Town: Group Counseling-Control	38
Table 27	- Grade Change Scores by Town: Group Counseling-Control	40
Table 28	- SSHA Percentile Scores: Group Counseling-Control	42
Table 29	- FIRO-F Scores: Group Counseling-Control	44
Table 30	- FIRO-B Scores: Group Counseling-Control	45
Table 31a	- Tennessee Self Concept Scale Scores: Group Counseling-Control	47
Table 31b	- Tennessee Self Concept Scale Scores: Group Counseling-Control	48
Table 32	- Ratings of Improvement: Group Counseling-Control	51

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

		Page
Sample	- Student Self Rating Questionnaire	52
Sample	- Parent Questionnaire	55
Table 33	- Diagnostic Screening and Testing	57
Table 34	- Parental Contact by Project Staff	58
Table 35	- Inservices/Presentations	59
Table 36	- On-Site Visitations to Project Center	63
Table 37	- Multi-Media Materials Catalogue Dissemination	64
Table 38	- Alphabetical Listing by State of Disseminated Catalogues	65

PROGRAM EVALUATION METHODS AND PROCEDURES:

The Oklahoma Title VI-G Child Service Demonstration Center had undergone two previous annual evaluations during the grant funding period of 1973-75. The present and third annual evaluation endeavors to provide a cross-validation of the important findings of the first two years for students new to the program.

It also examined in full the merits of implementing group counseling for students within the program who were showing evidence of affective blocks to their learning. The previous annual evaluation (1974-75) found that group counseling on randomly selected students did not clearly enhance the student's over-all learning rate or general adaptation to school. Therefore, some refinements in the group counseling procedures were implemented for 1975-76 and only students who were seen as having affective difficulties were included in this adjunctive treatment.

Subjects:

Subjects involved in the program evaluation were students, from the seventh to the twelfth grades, who had been assessed via a psychoeducational evaluation to be learning disabled. These students were then placed in the learning resource room in the six rural/semi-rural school districts of Cushing, Drumright, Perkins, Ripley, Stroud and Yale.

A total of 142 students were served directly by the program throughout the year, of which 99 were males and 43 were females. A further analysis of the number of students served by town and ethnic or racial identification appears in Table 1. Native Americans represent 8.5% of the total population directly served by the project. In the towns of Stroud (17.6%) and Drumright (16%), the number of Native Americans served speaks to the point made in the contract proposal, i.e., the catchment area includes significant numbers of Native Americans.

In the analyses to follow, not all of the 142 students are included. 23 students were placed back in the regular classroom

TABLE 1

ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECT STUDENTS

School District	Total Number of Students Served	Caucasian	Black	Native American	Mexican American	Vietnamese	Other
Cushing	25	21	1	3			
Drumright	25	21		4			
Perkins	19	17		2			
Ripley	30	28			1	1	
Stroud	17	14		3			
Yale	26	26					
Total	142	127	1	12	1	1	-

(Table 2). Several students moved out of their respective school districts, and various students were not present on the days when certain types of data were being collected.

Procedures:

1. Following the heavy schedule of standardized testing the previous year, it was decided to involve only the students new to the program in the major part of the evaluation testing program. The decision was made not only for the above reason, but also because the main thrust of this third annual evaluation was cross-validation of the findings of the previous two years. Therefore, the instruments used were a combination of those used for both the first and second year of operation.

2. Evaluation activities focused on the adjunctive treatment of group counseling rather than biofeedback. The benefits of biofeedback were judged as much more clear than those of group counseling in the 1974-75 evaluation. Therefore, refinements were made in the group counseling area to better evaluate its potential merits as an affective education component in a curriculum for learning disabled adolescents.

The following refinements were made:

(a) Students were not randomnly assigned to group counseling, but were specifically chosen by their resource room teacher as being in need of this service.

(b) Each group was led by not one leader (1974-75) but a team of two co-facilitators.

(c) Project staff members were used as co-facilitators in each of the four groups. In Drumright and Ripley, both co-facilitators were project staff. In Cushing and Yale, one of the co-facilitators was a project staff member. The non-project staff facilitators were graduate practicum students in Counseling from Oklahoma State University.

(d) The structure of the groups was changed in two ways: first, the theoretical orientation of all four groups was

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF STUDENTS MAINSTREAED
JULY 1, 1975 - JUNE 30, 1976

School District	Total Number of Students Served	Students Mainstreamed
Cushing	25	4
Drumright	25	2
Stroud	17	1
Ripley	30	7
Perkins	19	7
Yale	26	4
Total	142	25

the same - Reality Therapy; second, the activities within the group were completely left up to the discretion of the facilitators' judgment.

(e) One of the project consultants, before the initiation of the group counseling program, went to a workshop held by William Glasser on Reality Therapy. He then came back and led a supervisory orientation session for the facilitators. Throughout the duration of group counseling, which went from January to May on a once per week schedule, this consultant was available for supervision of the groups' activities.

3. The new towns of Perkins and Stroud were not included in the group counseling activities for the purpose of standardizing as much as possible the experience of the Child Service Demonstration Center diagnostic-prescriptive model. Since these towns were specifically cross-validation sites, a comparison of pre-post I.Q. changes (for these students) with the finding from the 1973-74 evaluation was seen as crucial. Therefore, it was essential to attempt to maintain the same services that were delivered to the other four towns in 1973-74.

4. Data collection with standardized psychometric instruments occurred within one month of entry into the program (pre-test) and then again in April (post-test).

5. School grades were secured from the schools' records for all the students in the program by the resource room teacher, and compiled for the first and third grading periods.

6. A pre and post test of the WISC-R was given to a random sample of 18 students from the towns of Stroud and Perkins (nine from Stroud; 9 from Perkins).

7. A pre and post test of the Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty Test was given to a random sample of 12 students with the restriction that two students came from each of the six towns and that 8 males and 4 females be included in the sample. These restrictions were made on the random sampling to insure a repre-

sentative sex and town stratification of the sample.

Instruments and Measures:

School Grades

School grades for the first and third nine week grading periods were collected from the six schools for all the students in the program. Four subjects were examined in this respect. These were English, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies. These measures have been used in the two previous evaluations.

Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children - Revised

The WISC-R was administered to a random sample of nine Perkins and nine Stroud students in a pre-post fashion - before entry and then in April. This testing yielded three major measures - Verbal I.Q., Performance I.Q. and Full Scale I.Q. The individual subtest change scores were also computed to be presented in a descriptive manner. These measures were used in the 1973-74 evaluation.

Wide Range Achievement Test

The WRAT was administered to all the students in the program in a pre-post fashion - in September and in April. This test yielded three change scores in the Reading, Spelling and Arithmetic achievement areas.

These measures have been used in the two previous evaluations.

Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty

This test was administered in a pre-post (September-April) fashion to a random sample of 12 students, stratified by town and sex. This testing yielded 7 separate measures of reading grade level - Oral Reading, Silent Rate, Silent Comprehension, Word Recognition-Flash, Word Recognition-Analysis, Visual Memory and Phonetic Spelling. This test has been used in the two previous evaluations.

Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes (SSHA)

This standardized questionnaire was given in group administration to all new students in the program in a pre-post fashion (within one month of program entry - April). It was included to

obtain estimates of both behavioral and attitudinal factors that correlate well with academic achievement, but are not related to intelligence. All questions and the answer options were read to the students by the examiner. Several measures were derived from the SSHA: Percentile Scores on Word Methods, Delay Avoidance, Study Habits, Teacher Approval, Education Acceptance, Study Attitude and Study Orientation.

This test was used in the 1974-75 evaluation.

Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS)

This standardized questionnaire was given to all new students in the program, via group administration, in a manner and schedule similar to the SSHA. From this scale, the following 12 measures were computed: Total Conflict, Total Self Esteem, Identity Self Esteem, Self Acceptance, Behavior Self Esteem, Physical Self Esteem, Moral Self Esteem, Personal Self Esteem, Family Self Esteem, Social Self Esteem, Column Variability and Raw Variability. This test was used in the 1974-75 evaluation.

Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation - Behavior

The FIRO-B is a standardized questionnaire which was given to all new students in the program in a manner and schedule similar to the TSCS.

This questionnaire measures the degree and kind of interpersonal stance of the examinee. It is purported to tap three basic dimensions of interpersonal relations - affection, control and inclusion. The FIRO-B generates six measures: expressed inclusion, expressed control, expressed affection, wanted inclusion, wanted control and wanted affection. The difference between the expressed and wanted dimensions is that expressed measures the interpersonal signals that one is sending and wanted measures the interpersonal behavior that one desires from others. All of these measures are confined to the behavioral domain. The test was used in the 1974-75 evaluation.

Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation - Feeling

The FIRO-F is a standardized questionnaire which was given

to all new students in the program in a manner and schedule similar to the FIRO-B.

This questionnaire is a replica of the FIRO-B in form and theory. The only difference is the content of the questions and the confinement of the FIRO-F to the affective domain of interpersonal feelings. This test was used in the 1974-75 evaluation.

Resource Room Teacher's Student Evaluation

This was a form constructed by the evaluation consultant to obtain information on every student from the resource room teacher's perspective. Each resource room teacher in the six districts filled out one of these forms at the end of the school year on each of their students. The form requests both qualitative and quantitative information on the student. The qualitative information is a request for the teacher's subjective impressions of the student's work in the resource room, his strengths and weaknesses, his individual style and how it has changed. The quantitative information is a rating of the student's degree of change on a five point scale in both the academic and social-emotional areas, since the start of the school year. The five points are labelled worse now, no change, mild improvement, moderate improvement and great improvement. These are scored on a 4.0 system. This measure was used in the two previous evaluations.

Student Self Rating Questionnaire

This questionnaire, constructed by the evaluation consultant, consists of 20 items that ask the student to rate himself in various academic, behavioral and attitudinal areas. Each of the 20 items has 2 parts - one for a rating of his level of functioning upon entering the program, and the second for his rating of the improvement or worsening of himself in that particular area. Each item has a 3 point scale. The mean score is a change score in the 20 different areas, with a possible range of -2 to +2. These are converted to a 4.0 system. This measure was used in the 1973-74 evaluation.

All students rated themselves with this instrument.

Parent Questionnaire

This questionnaire consists of 14 items that ask the parent to rate his child in academic, behavioral and attitudinal areas, especially as they manifest themselves at home. The rating is in terms of improvement or worsening that has occurred since their child entered the program. The final item is slightly different than the others. It asks the parent to describe his relationship with his child as either warm, distant or angry. The score is the mean of the 14 items, with a possible range of -1 to +1. This score is converted to a 4.0 system. All parents of L. D. students in the program were sent a stamped, self-addressed envelope for their convenience. The questionnaire includes an introductory letter that explains the purpose of the questionnaire and assures them that the information is confidential, and will not be used to evaluate the child.

Results:

The results of the present evaluation appear below in a format that examines first the findings from the cognitive domain - intelligence, achievement and school grades. Secondly, the findings for the affective domain will be presented - SSHA, TSCS, FIRO-B and FIRO-F. Following the affective findings, the measures of rated improvement will be noted - the judged improvements by the resource room teachers, the students' self-ratings and the parents' ratings.

The next section will evaluate the merits of the group counseling components of the program by comparing those students involved in group counseling with those who were not given this component of the program.

COGNITIVE DOMAIN

WISC-R:

The 18 students randomly selected from the two schools in Perkins and Stroud were given post-test on the WISC-R to compare with the pre-test given before entry into the program. Table 3

presents the results of the three t tests on dependent samples that were performed to evaluate the reliability of the change scores on the Verbal I.Q., Performance I.Q. and Full Scale I.Q. measures derived from the WISC-R. In all three measures, significant differences were found between the pre and post test means in the improved direction. Therefore, the program seems to be aiding both Verbal and Performance I.Q.'s with the Performance I.Q. showing greater improvement (PIQ - 10.05; VIQ = 7.33). However, it should be pointed out that no control group was used in this analyses. However, Table 4 presents a comparison of the pre, post and change scores for the year's sample with both the program and control samples in the 1973-74 evaluation (WISC). Control subjects in 1973-74 were not placed in the program during that year. From this comparison, the verbal change score of this year's sample is greater than both 1973-74 groups (75-76 = +7.33 1973-74 P = +5.24 1973-74 C = +2.80). The importance of this finding is based on the fact that only Verbal I.Q. change was significantly greater for the program sample in the 1973-74 evaluation. Therefore, it is concluded that the specific verbal I.Q. enhancement finding from the 1973-74 evaluation has been cross-validated in the two new program sites for this year of operation.

TABLE 3

WISC-R PRE-POST CHANGE SCORES
ON VERBAL, PERFORMANCE AND FULL SCALE I.Q.

VERBAL I.Q.

Town	n	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Change Score	s	t value	p value
Perkins	9	85.67	91.78	+6.11			
Stroud	9	81.44	90.00	+8.56			
TOTAL	18	83.56	90.89	+7.33	8.55 (2.01)	3.65	.01

PERFORMANCE I.Q.

Town	n	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Change Score	s	t value	p value
Perkins	9	95.67	105.67	+10.00			
Stroud	9	98.22	108.33	+10.11			
TOTAL	18	96.95	107.00	+10.05	9.03 (2.13)	4.72	.001

FULL SCALE I.Q.

Town	n	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Change Score	s	t value	p value
Perkins	9	88.56	98.22	+9.66			
Stroud	9	88.33	98.33	+10.00			
TOTAL	18	88.45	98.28	+9.83	7.59 (1.79)	5.49	.001

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF 1975-76 PROGRAM SAMPLE WISC-R
CHANGE SCORES WITH 1973-74 WISC CHANGE SCORES

VERBAL I.Q.

Group	n	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Change Score
1975-76 Program	18	83.56	90.89	+7.33
1973-74 Program	30	87.83	93.07	+5.24
1973-74 Control	30	80.40	83.20	+2.80

PERFORMANCE I.Q.

Group	n	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Change Score
1975-76 Program	18	96.95	107.00	+10.05
1973-74 Program	30	98.47	110.54	+12.07
1973-74 Control	30	84.90	97.60	+12.70

FULL SCALE I.Q.

Group	n	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Change Score
1975-76 Program	18	88.45	98.28	+9.83
1973-74 Program	30	92.41	101.84	+9.43
1973-74 Control	30	80.77	89.03	+8.26

Table 4 also places the greater Performance I.Q. Change Score in the 1975-76 program sample in a different perspective. The 1975-76 program sample showed less change than either 1973-74 sample (1975-76 P = 10.05; 1973-74 P = 12.07; 1973-74 C = 12.70). Also in 1973-74, the two groups showed no reliable difference in Performance I.Q. enhancement.

Finally, the Full Scale I.Q. comparisons among the three groups shows no strong preference for any of the three groups, even though the 1975-76 sample showed the greatest change (1975-76 P = +9.83; 1973-74 P = +9.43; 1973-74 C = +8.26).

Table 5 permits a comparative descriptive analyses of the subtest pre, post and change scores for the three groups shown in Table 4. Two cautions must be noted here. First, the subtest reliabilities are considerably depressed from the 3 major I.Q. measures. Second, two separate tests are considered here: the WISC-R for the 1975-76 sample and the WISC for the two 1973-74 groups. Subtest reliabilities are generally greater for the WISC-R and content changes occurred for items throughout the WISC-R. These considerations must be kept in mind as one inspects the differential subtest change scores for the three groups.

TABLE 5

WECHSLER SUBTEST PRE, POST AND CHANGE SCORES:
COMPARISON OF 1975-76 PROGRAM SAMPLE, 1973-74 PROGRAM SAMPLE
AND 1973-74 CONTROL SAMPLE

Subtest	GROUP								
	1975-76 Program			1973-74 Program			1973-74 Control		
	Pre	Post	Change	Pre	Post	Change	Pre	Post	Change
Information	6.45	7.60	+1.15	7.4	7.8	+0.4	6.5	6.5	0
Similarities	7.65	9.15	+1.50	9.1	12.0	+2.9	7.6	8.5	+0.9
Arithmetic	6.85	7.90	+1.05	7.5	8.0	+0.5	6.9	6.7	-0.2
Vocabulary	7.15	8.00	+0.85	8.1	8.3	+0.2	6.4	6.9	+0.5
Comprehension	9.00	9.70	+0.70	8.2	8.7	+0.5	6.5	7.4	+0.9
Digit Span	7.20	6.70	-0.50						
Picture Completion	9.55	12.10	+2.55	10.1	11.9	+1.8	7.9	9.9	+2.0
Picture Arrangement	10.30	11.50	+1.20	10.0	10.6	+0.6	7.6	8.9	+1.3
Block Design	9.30	10.50	+1.20	9.6	10.7	+1.1	7.5	9.0	+1.5
Object Assembly	10.65	11.55	+0.90	10.2	12.6	+2.4	7.9	10.8	+2.9
Coding	7.70	8.45	+0.75	9.5	11.6	+2.1	8.4	10.0	+1.6

For the Verbal subtests (Digit Span was not included in the 1973-74 evaluation) the 1975-76 group shows greater improvement on 3 of the 5 subtests: Information, Arithmetic and Vocabulary. On Similarities, the 1973-74 program sample showed the greatest improvement, followed by the 1975-76 program sample, with the control sample showing the least improvement of the three groups. On Comprehension, the 1973-74 control sample showed the greatest improvement, followed by the 1975-76 program sample, with the 1973-74 program sample showing the least improvement.

For the Performance subtests, the 1975-76 program sample showed the greatest improvement on only Picture Completion, and showed the least improvement of the 3 groups on both Object Assembly and Coding. On Picture Arrangement and Block Design, the 1973-74 control sample showed the greatest improvement, followed by the 1975-76 sample, with the 1973-74 program sample showing the least improvement.

In conclusion, the WISC-R analyses show verbal I.Q. enhancement for this year's program sample in the two new sites of Perkins and Stroud. This bolsters the finding that the Oklahoma Child Service Demonstration Center diagnostic-prescriptive program specifically enhances verbal I.Q. by cross-validation to a completely new population of students. Since verbal I.Q. has consistently been found to be the area of deficit in secondary L. D. students, the practical importance of this finding cannot be overstated.

WRAT:

All students in the program were given the WRAT in September and again in April - a 7 month span. Table 6 shows the results for the 3 subtests of the WRAT and a mean achievement score (grade level). All three areas showed significant improvement. T tests for dependant samples were performed to evaluate the reliability of the change scores. The t values are included in the table. However, an inspection of Table 6 shows a good deal of variability from town to town on the

different subtests. Interviews with the project staff helped clarify the discrepancies.

Yale and Ripley deviated the most from the other four towns in the direction of least improvement on the mean achievement scores. This was an anomaly to the evaluation consultant because the resource room teachers in these two towns were the most experienced of the six in the project. Also their two classes the previous year showed the greatest achievement gains. The puzzle was solved when the distribution of prescriptive services were examined. As a result of the increase in the numbers of towns served from 4 to 6, the ratio of prescriptive teacher to resource room dropped from 1:2 to 1:3, since the project did not add a prescriptive teacher. The strain in this ratio was unintentionally made up at the expense of the Yale and Ripley resource rooms.

TABLE 6

WRAT READING, SPELLING AND ARITHMETIC GRADE LEVEL
PRE, POST AND CHANGE SCORES FOR THE SIX TOWNS

Town	n	Pre	Post	Change	Prorated Change*
			READING		
Cushing	23	4.58	5.24	+0.96	+1.37
Drumright	13	4.81	5.73	+0.92	+1.31
Perkins	14	4.76	5.06	+0.30	+0.43
Ripley	18	5.36	5.56	+0.20	+0.29
Stroud	12	3.31	4.95	+1.64	+2.34
Yale	20	4.97	5.29	+0.32	+0.46
Total	100	4.70	5.31	+0.61	+0.87
				t (99 df) = 2.12, p .05	
			SPELLING		
Cushing	20	3.08	3.48	+0.40	+0.57
Drumright	13	4.40	5.13	+0.73	+1.04
Perkins	13	4.18	5.18	+1.00	+1.43
Ripley	18	4.66	5.08	+0.42	+0.60
Stroud	12	3.25	4.11	+0.86	+1.23
Yale	20	4.21	4.29	+0.08	+0.11
Total	96	3.96	4.48	+0.52	+0.74
				t (95 df) = 2.01, p .05	
			ARITHMETIC		
Cushing	22	4.81	5.44	+0.63	+0.90
Drumright	13	4.93	5.78	+0.85	+1.21
Perkins	12	4.64	5.27	+0.63	+0.90
Ripley	18	5.04	5.28	+0.24	+0.34
Stroud	12	4.01	5.44	+1.43	+2.04
Yale	20	4.97	5.14	+0.17	+0.24
Total	97	4.78	5.37	+0.59	+0.84
				t (96 df) = 2.07, p .05	
			MEAN ACHIEVEMENT		
Cushing		4.20	4.76	+0.56	+0.80
Drumright		4.71	5.55	+0.84	+1.20
Perkins		4.53	5.16	+0.63	+0.90
Ripley		5.02	5.31	+0.29	+0.41
Stroud		3.52	4.83	+1.31	+1.87
Yale		4.72	4.91	+0.19	+0.27
Total		4.48	5.05	+0.57	+0.81

*Prorated Change Score = $\frac{\text{Score}}{.7}$ = Grade Level Change over 10 month year.

TABLE 7

WRAT ACHIEVEMENT GRADE LEVEL CHANGE SCORES:
COMPARISON OF THREE YEARS OPERATIONS

Year	Prorated Change Score*	Pre-Test Level
READING		
1st - 1973-74	+1.29	5.7
2nd - 1974-75	+1.44	4.05
3rd - 1975-76	+0.87	4.70
3rd - 1975-76 (minus Yale and Ripley)	+1.36	
SPELLING		
1st - 1973-74	+0.47	4.89
2nd - 1974-75	+0.89	3.40
3rd - 1975-76	+0.74	3.96
3rd - 1975-76 (minus Yale and Ripley)	+1.06	
ARITHMETIC		
1st - 1973-74	+0.96	5.50
2nd - 1974-75	+0.67	3.90
3rd - 1975-76	+0.84	4.78
3rd - 1975-76 (minus Yale and Ripley)	+1.26	
MEAN ACHIEVEMENT		
1st - 1973-74	+0.91	5.36
2nd - 1974-75	+1.00	3.78
3rd - 1975-76	+0.82	4.48
3rd - 1975-76 (minus Yale and Ripley	+1.19	

* All values have been converted to a 10 month basis.

This was discovered when the number of contacts by the two prescriptive teachers were investigated. Because of the experience of the two teachers in Yale and Ripley, they received less prescriptive contacts than did the other four towns. The need, accurately perceived by the two prescriptive teachers, was greater in the other four towns for their services. Therefore, the more experienced teachers in Yale and Ripley were more on their own than the other four resource room teachers or during previous years.

Table 7 depicts a comparative analyses of WRAT improvement measures over the three year history of the project. In Reading, the 1.29 grade level improvement in the first year was enhanced in the second year to 1.44 years. This past year, over the six towns, the reading improvement index dropped to .87 years. The Pre-Test Level is provided in the table to show that this alternative hypothesis for the drop does not explain the decrement seen the past year. It was considered that the lower the achievement level of the students, the greater the improvement possible. However, the Pre-Test Level column in Table 7 contradicts this hypothesis. For example, on Mean Achievement, while the second year showed the lowest Pre-Test Level at 3.78 and also the greatest improvement with +1.00 years, the first year group had the highest Pre-Test level, but showed the next greatest degree of improvement.

However, if one notes the values for this third year, minus those of Yale and Ripley, the decrement in improvement the third year is better explained.

Values for the four towns receiving an amount of prescriptive services at a ratio equal to the two previous years shows comparable or greater gains in all areas of achievement.

In conclusion, this third year of operation showed significant gains in achievement in WRAT Reading, Spelling and Arithmetic scores. However, for both Reading and Spelling, there was a drop from the improvement made the previous year. This drop is best explained by the increased strain on the prescriptive

teacher/resource room teacher ratio caused by adding two additional resource rooms without increasing the prescriptive teacher staff. If this conclusion is correct, it reinforces the basic assumption that the diagnostic-prescriptive model is mediating these achievement gains. Serendipitously, this past year showed a reduction in prescriptive services to two of the towns served by the Oklahoma Child Service Demonstration Center and a consequent drop in achievement gains.

Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulties:

To further investigate the area of reading achievement, the Durrell was administered in a pre-post fashion to a stratified random sample of 12 students within the program. The sample was stratified by town and sex, with two students from each of the six towns and eight males and four females represented. The span between pre and post testing was seven months (September - April) and the data presented in Table 8 is prorated to a ten month improvement index.

While the WRAT provides a measure of word recognition component of Reading, the Durrell provides a more complete view of the processes involved in Reading.

Table 8 shows the results for this year's sample; Table 9 depicts a comparative analysis of prorated change scores across the three years of operation of the Oklahoma Child Service Demonstration Center. For the present sample (Table 8) five of the seven areas showed reliable improvements; in the order of the improvement, these areas were Word Recognition, Oral Reading, Word Analysis, Phonetic Spelling and Silent Rate. The improvements in Silent Comprehension and Visual Memory did not reach statistical significance.

Table 9 shows that Oral Reading, Word Recognition and Word Analysis has been a consistent area of improvement across the three years. Silent Rate over the past two years has shown improvement. The three areas of Silent Comprehension, Visual Memory and Phonetic

Spelling present a more complicated picture. The past year has seen a drop in the improvement in Silent Comprehension, which merits the attention of the Child Service Demonstration Center staff. However, while Silent Comprehension has shown a decrement, Phonetic Spelling has shown a reliable improvement over the previous year. Visual Memory has for the past two years shown no reliable improvement. Conceivably, this is an area of basic deficit that cannot be remediated or easily compensated.

In conclusion, Oral Reading, Word Recognition and Word Analyses are areas of reading which have shown strong, reliable improvement over the three year history of the Oklahoma Child Service Demonstration Center.

TABLE 8

DURRELL ANALYSIS OF READING DIFFICULTY
MEAN PRORATED GRADE LEVEL SCORES*

Area	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Change Scale	p Value
Oral Reading	3.56	4.88	1.32	.01
Silent Rate	3.52	4.35	0.83	.05
Silent Comprehension	4.41	5.12	0.71	ns
Word Recognition	4.60	5.98	1.38	.01
Word Analysis	4.55	5.69	1.14	.01
Visual Memory	3.16	3.93	0.77	ns
Phonetic Spelling	4.24	5.10	0.86	.05
Total	4.01	5.01	1.00	

* Change Scores are based on prorated value for 10 months.

TABLE 9

DURRELL GRADE LEVEL PRORATED CHANGE SCORES:
COMPARISON OF THREE YEARS OPERATIONS

Area	Year		
	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76
Oral Reading	1.29	1.47	1.32
Silent Rate	0.26	1.23	0.83
Silent Comprehension	-	1.47	0.71
Word Recognition	2.34	1.33	1.38
Word Analysis	2.91	0.88	1.14
Visual Memory	2.06	0.53	0.77
Phonetic Spelling	1.61	0.43	0.86
Total	1.75	1.05	1.00

School Grades:

The effects of the program on the student's grades in English, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies were investigated by a set of four t tests for dependent samples. Tables 10, 11, 12 and 13 depict the mean first nine weeks grading period, third nine weeks grading period and the change in grades for English, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies, respectively. These tables also show an analyses by town. However, the t tests were computed on only the total number of scores.

English showed the greatest improvement, from a C to a C+. Social Studies showed the second greatest improvement from a D to a D+. Math was ranked third in terms of improvement, from a D+ to a C. Science was ranked fourth of the four subject areas, from a D to a D+. To summarize the findings of these analyses on this year's grades, significant improvement was shown on all four curriculum areas. The magnitude of this gain ranged from one-quarter of a grade to one-half of a grade.

Table 14 shows a comparison of the grade change scores over the three year history of the project. Also, these data are based only on the change from the first to the third nine weeks grading periods. For the 1974-75 year, all changes are negative. However, the change from the first to the second nine weeks during 1974-75 was a strong positive gain. The first and third grading periods were chosen because of similarity of seasons (late October to early March) and also relative distance from contaminating motivational factors (Christmas and summer vacations).

In Math and Science, this past year showed the greatest gain in relation to the other three samples of grade changes. While these two subjects showed the weakest grade changes among the four areas for this year's sample, the comparative analysis shows that the relative gains in Math and Science are the strongest.

TABLE 10

ENGLISH GRADES*

Town	n	First Grading Period	Third Grading Period	Change
Cushing	23	2.38	2.72	+.34
Perkins	14	1.79	2.14	+.35
Ripley	23	1.68	2.12	+.44
Stroud	13	1.62	2.24	+.62
Yale	20	2.28	2.73	+.45
Total	93	1.99	2.419	+.429

$t(92df) = 3.27, p < .01$

*All grades based on 4.0 system.

TABLE 11

MATH GRADES*

Town	n	First Grading Period	Third Grading Period	Change
Cushing	20	1.92	2.37	+.45
Perkins	13	2.23	2.31	+.08
Ripley	13	1.74	1.77	+.03
Stroud	11	1.73	1.62	-.11
Yale	11	0.92	1.83	+.91
Total	68	1.75	2.033	+.283

$t(67df) = 2.09, p < .05$

*All grades based on 4.0 system.

TABLE 12

SCIENCE GRADES*

Town	n	First Grading Period	Third Grading Period	Change
Cushing	11	0.63	1.07	+.44
Perkins	13	0.85	1.54	+.69
Ripley	15	1.63	1.66	+.03
Stroud	11	1.36	1.36	0
Yale	17	0.76	0.94	+.18
Total	67	0.976	1.235	+.259

$t(66df) = 2.43, p < .05$

*All grades based on 4.0 system.

TABLE 13

SOCIAL STUDIES GRADES*

Town	n	First Grading Period	Third Grading Period	Change
Cushing	18	1.11	1.62	+.51
Perkins	10	1.20	1.60	+.40
Ripley	17	1.11	1.38	+.27
Stroud	9	1.33	1.11	-.22
Yale	12	0.81	1.26	+.45
Total	66	1.10	1.421	+.321

$t(65df) = 2.24, p < .05$

*All grades based on 4.0 system.

TABLE 14

CHANGE* IN GRADES IN FOUR SUBJECT AREAS
COMPARISON OF THREE YEARS OF OPERATION

Year	English	Math	Science	Social Studies	Total
1973-74 -					
Treatment	+.12	+.05	-.01	+.36	+.13
Control	+.43	+.03	-.20	+.17	+.11
1974-75	-.44	-.49	-.37	+.02	-.33
1975-76	+.43	+.28	+.26	+.32	+.32

*Changes scores are based on the 4.0 system and indicate changes from the first to the third nine weeks grading periods only.

Also across all four subjects, this year showed the greatest mean change of any of [illegible] samples - a full one-third of a grade change.

Summary: Cognit[illegible]omain

This year's evaluation of the Oklahoma Child Service Demonstration Center provided strong evidence of the diagnostic-prescriptive model's enhancement of Verbal I.Q. by a cross-validation of the 1973-74 finding to a totally new population of students.

An intensive analysis of the program's effects on processes essential to Reading through a comparative analysis of the Durrell gains over the three year history of the program showed the areas of Oral Reading, Word Recognition and Word Analysis to exhibit reliable improvement. Also there's a suggestion from this investigation that Visual Memory may be a neuropsychological process that is not susceptible to remediation; at least not by the methods used within this model.

This year's evaluation also found a lack of correspondence between achievement gains and grade gains. A similar lack of correspondence between these two measures of academic achievement was evident in last year's evaluation. In 1973-74, the situation was

strong linear achievement test gains across time, at variance with the grade changes which were curvilinear across time - improvement between the first and second marking periods and then dropping for the third and fourth periods. It was judged that grades are much more complexly determined than were achievement gains. An inspection of the trend across time of motivational factors led the author to suggest that the grade decrement seen in 1973-74 was based on lowered motivation as the academic year wore on.

In the present year, the relative lack of correspondence between grades and achievement gains is in the opposite direction. Grades this year showed strong gains, while overall achievement increments were the weakest of the three years. The best explanation for this situation is again a motivational one. Although the results on the Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes have yet to be presented in this document, this year showed minimal decrements on the SSHA, i.e., motivation was relatively constant for the two time samples. This differs from the marked decrements across time found in last year's evaluation for this measure of academic motivation. Therefore, it is concluded that the grade gains seen this year provide a complex and global index of academic improvement for the students served by the program.

AFFECTIVE DOMAIN

(All affective domain analyses are based only on students new to the program).

Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes:

Tables 15-21 depict the results of the tabulations and analyses for the following seven scales of the SSHA: Delay Avoidance, Work Methods, Study Habits, Teacher Approval, Educational Acceptance, Study Attitudes, Study Orientation. t tests for dependent samples were performed on the total number of subjects for each scale. None of the seven scales showed significant change from pre to post test.

Therefore, no reliable change was seen in the SSHA scales for this year. On the whole, the students reported study habits and attitudes to be between the 20th to the 25th percentiles, with a nonsignificant trend for both their habits and attitudes to decrease by about two percentile points.

Table 22 shows the comparison between this year's results and last year's results on the SSHA change scores from the beginning to the end of the year. It should be noted that all these changes in this table were nonsignificant. Table 22 shows that in all areas the mean change scores for this last year show less decrease across the year. The students' study habits and attitudes either did not suffer any drop this past year, or the variability of their changes was so great as to make these decrements unreliable.

TABLE 15

SSHA PRE, POST AND CHANGE SCORES* BY TOWN:
DELAY AVOIDANCE SCALE

Town	n	Pre	Post	Change
Cushing	9	31.2	23.7	-7.5
Drumright	8	25.0	23.8	-1.2
Perkins	10	19.0	20.6	+1.6
Ripley	6	10.5	23.3	+12.8
Stroud	13	40.0	31.2	-8.8
Yale	5	35.0	26.0	-9.0
Total	51	28.02	25.20	-2.82

*All table entries are in percentiles.

TABLE 16

SSHA PRE, POST, CHANGE SCORES* BY TOWN:
WORK METHODS SCALE

Town	n	Pre	Post	Change
Cushing	9	22.8	21.7	-1.1
Drumright	8	17.4	25.6	+8.2
Perkins	10	16.2	19.9	+3.7
Ripley	6	7.3	23.3	+16.0
Stroud	13	39.1	24.3	-14.8
Yale	5	46.0	31.0	-15.0
Total	51	25.26	23.69	-1.57

*All table entries are in percentiles.

Table 17

SSHA PRE, POST, CHANGE SCORES* BY TOWN:
STUDY HABITS SCALE

Town	n	Pre	Post	Change
Cushing	9	24.0	20.3	-3.7
Drumright	8	20.6	23.1	+2.5
Perkins	10	17.4	17.9	+0.5
Ripley	6	6.0	18.3	-12.3
Stroud	13	38.5	24.8	-13.7
Yale	5	38.0	25.0	-13.0
Total	51	25.12	21.64	-3.48

*All table entries are in percentiles

TABLE 18

SSHA PRE, POST AND CHANGE SCORES* BY TOWN:
TEACHER APPROVAL

Town	n	Pre	Post	Changes
Cushing	9	23.9	30.6	+6.7
Drumright	8	17.5	18.8	+1.3
Perkins	10	16.7	15.5	-1.2
Ripley	6	11.0	23.3	+12.3
Stroud	13	39.2	24.9	-14.3
Yale	5	34.6	29.4	-5.2
Total	51	24.92	23.36	-1.56

*All table entries are in percentile

TABLE 19

SSHA PRE, POST AND CHANGE SCORES* BY TOWN:
EDUCATIONAL ACCEPTANCE

Town	n	Pre	Post	Changes
Cushing	9	17.8	19.9	+2.1
Drumright	8	20.1	22.5	+1.4
Perkins	10	8.9	15.0	+6.1
Ripley	6	19.3	16.7	-2.6
Stroud	13	33.5	22.8	-10.7
Yale	5	38.0	26.2	-11.8
Total	51	22.57	20.33	-2.24

*All table entries are in percentiles.

TABLE 20

SSHA PRE, POST AND CHANGE SCORES* BY TOWN:
STUDY ATTITUDE

Town	n	Pre	Post	Changes
Cushing	9	19.6	29.6	+10.0
Drumright	8	15.8	17.5	+1.7
Perkins	10	11.1	14.0	+2.9
Ripley	6	11.9	19.2	+7.3
Stroud	13	35.0	22.7	+12.3
Yale	5	34.0	27.4	-6.6
Total	51	21.77	22.09	-0.32

*All table entries are in percentiles

TABLE 21

SSHA PRE, POST AND CHANGE SCORES*BY TOWN:
STUDY ORIENTATION

Town	n	Pre	Post	Changes
Cushing	9	19.4	22.3	+2.9
Drumright	8	15.0	17.5	+2.5
Perkins	10	11.2	12.7	+1.5
Ripley	6	7.2	15.0	+7.8
Stroud	13	35.0	21.4	+13.6
Yale	5	33.0	23.8	-9.2
Total	51	20.98	18.72	-2.26

*All table entries are in percentiles

TABLE 22

COMPARISON OF SSHA CHANGE SCORES*
BETWEEN 1974-75 AND 1975-76

Scale	Year	Change Score
Study Habits	1974-75	-13.04
	1975-76	- 3.48
Study Attitudes	1974-75	- 9.87
	1975-76	- 0.32
Study Orientation	1974-75	-11.36
	1975-76	- 2.26

*Table entries are based on post-pre scores in percentiles, from September-April.

Tennessee Self Concept Scale:

The following subscales of the TSCS were examined by a set of t tests for dependent samples on all new students' pre and post-test scores: Total Conflict; Total Self Esteem; Identity Esteem; Self-Acceptance; Behavior Esteem; Physical Self Esteem; Moral Self Esteem; Personal Self Esteem; Family Self Esteem; Social Self Esteem; Esteem Dimension Variability; and Area Esteem Variability.

The only finding that was significant was that for change in Social Self Esteem: a t (49df) of 1.79 proved to be marginally significant with a p .10. Therefore there is marginal evidence of the program's effects on students new to the program of enhancing their esteem as a member of a peer group. In all other areas, the mean change scores were so minimal to suggest no change occurred throughout the year in the other areas of self esteem.

A more complete discussion of esteem characteristics will be presented in a later section.

Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation: Feelings and Behavior:

The FIRO-F and FIRO-B were also administered to all students

new to the program in a pre-post fashion similar to the SSHA and TSCS.

A set of t tests for dependent samples were performed to examine the reliability of any changes seen in the 12 separate measures. The following six scales are included on both the FIRO-F and FIRO-B: expressed inclusion, wanted inclusion, expressed control, wanted control, expressed affection and wanted affection.

None of the 12 interpersonal stance measures on either the feeling or behavioral levels showed significant change from the pre to the post test. A more complete discussion of this population's interpersonal characteristics will be presented in a later section.

Summary: Affective Domain:

For this year's operations, with measures on only students new to the program, no reliable changes were made in any of the measures used to tap the affective domain. A marginal effect on improvement in social self esteem does replicate an effect from 1974-75; however, this effect is only marginal.

Several explanations for this globally unspectacular set of findings are available. Possibly affective improvements do not occur within an educational program within a single academic year. Last year's evaluation, which did show a variety of affective improvements was based on data from all students within the program, not simply students new to the program.

Another explanation might be that the affective measures produced only a random array of numbers, with the lack of significance based on the unreliability of the instruments or the procedures for data collection. This explanation cannot definitely be ruled out, but the closeness in the mean values of the measures on the pre and post test speak against this explanation. While the data analyses are not possible within the scope of this evaluation to confirm the first explanation, it does appear the more likely.

RATED IMPROVEMENT

Resource Room Teacher's Student Evaluation:

Table 23 presents the results of the resource room teacher's ratings of improvement for her students in both academic and social-emotional areas. Data is presented for all six towns on a 4.0 system.

In both academic and social-emotional areas, the resource room teachers view the degree of improvement as between mild and moderate, but closer to mild improvement.

TABLE 23

RESOURCE ROOM TEACHER'S STUDENT EVALUATION*

Town	n	Academic	Social-Emotional	Overall
Cushing	23	2.65	2.26	2.46
Drumright	12	2.25	2.17	2.21
Perkins	14	1.86	2.14	2.00
Ripley	18	2.44	2.67	2.56
Stroud	15	2.20	2.60	2.40
Yale	20	2.18	1.70	1.99
Total	102	2.32	2.25	2.29

*All entries are based on 4.0 system.
0 = worse now; 1 = no change; 2 = mild improvement; 3 = moderate improvement; 4 = great improvement.

Student Self Rating Questionnaire:

All students within the program rated their improvement on this 20 item questionnaire. Scoring was converted to a 4.0 system to make it comparable to the teacher's ratings. Table 24 presents

this data by town. Overall the students rate themselves as moderately improved, which is a higher rating than that given by their resource room teachers.

Parent Questionnaire:

All parents of students within the program were sent questionnaires to assess their judgment of change in their children, especially as they appear at home. A stamped self-addressed envelope was provided. These procedures produced a 75.5% return on these questionnaires, which is well above the return rate of 34.7% for the 1973-74 evaluation. This increment in return rate probably indicates a greater awareness and participation in the program by parents than was the case in the Child Service Demonstration Center's first year of operation.

Table 25 presents this data by town. All data was converted to a 4.0 system. The mean value of 3.26 indicates that parents view their children as moderately to greatly improved since the children entered the program.

Qualitative data concerning these parent questionnaires was that there were seven lengthy testimonials given by various parents thanking the program staff for the great changes that have occurred in their children. Therefore, close to 10% of parents who returned questionnaires also wrote lengthy accompanying testimonials and letters of appreciation.

Summary: Rated Improvement

All three sets of observers of the program's effects - resource room teachers, students and parents - judged the program as having definite beneficial effects.

The degree of improvement was interestingly judged highest by the parents, next by the pupils and least by the resource room teachers. All three groups had average ratings of at least mild improvement.

In conclusion, the program is seen as overall producing a moderate degree of improvement in those students served by the program. This shows a gain over the mild degree of improvement judged in the first annual evaluation.

TABLE 24

STUDENT SELF RATING QUESTIONNAIRE*

Town	n	Mean Value
Cushing	19	3.28
Drumright	16	2.91
Perkins	12	2.43
Ripley	21	2.90
Stroud	14	3.28
Yale	20	2.97
Total	102	2.98

*The values are based on a 4.0 system.

TABLE 25

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Town	n	Mean Value
Cushing	16	3.46
Drumright	10	3.14
Perkins	13	2.98
Ripley	19	3.23
Stroud	9	3.32
Yale	10	3.39
Total	77	3.26

*The values are based on a 4.0 system.

GROUP COUNSELING

The final section of the present program evaluation is intended to evaluate the group counseling component of the Oklahoma Child Service Demonstration Center. This adjunctive treatment was applied to only those students judged as in need of such services by their resource room teacher.

This component was evaluated by a set of t tests for independent samples. One sample on each measure examined was those students involved in group counseling. A total of 24 students from the four older sites of Cushing, Drumright, Ripley and Yale were involved in group counseling. However, not all of these 24 are represented on all measures due to data shrinkages for a variety of reasons. The control group for the evaluation of the effects of the group counseling are comparable students in the program who did not receive group counseling. This control group is exactly the same as the group counseling sample except that they did not receive group counseling nor were they referred for group counseling.

Cognitive Domain:

Table 26 shows the results of the analyses of the WRAT change scores for the group counseling and control conditions. t tests for independent samples were performed on only the totals of the four towns. All t tests showed no significant difference between the two conditions. However, the overall achievement mean was higher for the group counseling. Three of the four counseling groups showed overall positive changes, but Yale showed an overall negative change relative to the control. Since Yale also showed group counseling to have a negative effect on each of the three achievement areas, an examination of the difference between Yale and the other three counseling groups is warranted. Yale was the one town where the counseling group was led by a person who was not a member of the Child Service Demonstration Center staff. In Yale,

the resource room teacher served as an auxilary group leader to represent the Center, but in all the other three towns, a member of the intervention team led the group. While this evidence is only suggestive of an explanation for the difference between Yale and the other three towns, it does match some of the qualitative data that led to a modification of group counseling for 1975-76 to include Child Service Demonstration Center intervention team members as group leaders.

TABLE 26

WRAT CHANGE SCORES* BY TOWN:
GROUP COUNSELING - CONTROL

Achievement Area	Town	Change Scores				
		Group Counseling	n	Control	n	Difference
READING	Cushing	+0.99	7	+0.92	16	+ .07
	Drumright	+1.17	5	+1.38	11	- .21
	Ripley	+0.71	4	+0.45	13	+ .26
	Yale	-0.11	5	+0.65	15	- .76
	Total	+1.00	21	+0.83	55	+ .17
		t(74df) = 0.79, ns				
SPELLING	Cushing	+0.37	7	+0.63	16	- .26
	Drumright	+2.06	5	+0.58	11	+1.48
	Ripley	+0.86	4	+0.46	13	+ .40
	Yale	+0.03	5	+0.14	15	- .11
	Total	+0.83	21	+0.45	55	+ .38
		t(74df) = 1.54, ns				
ARITHMETIC	Cushing	+0.94	7	+0.88	16	+ .06
	Drumright	+1.31	5	+1.17	11	+ .14
	Ripley	+0.29	4	+0.30	13	- .01
	Yale	-0.31	5	+0.43	15	- .74
	Total	+0.61	21	+0.68	55	- .07
		t(74df) = -0.31, ns				
OVERALL	Cushing	+0.90	7	+0.76	16	+ .14
	Drumright	+1.51	5	+1.04	11	+ .47
	Ripley	+0.64	5	+0.36	13	+ .28
	Yale	-0.13	5	+0.40	15	- .53
	Total	+0.75	21	+0.63	55	+ .12
		t(74df) = 0.57, ns				

*All table entries are grade levels prorated on a ten-month basis.

Table 27 depicts the grade changes by town for the group counseling and control conditions in English, Math, Science and Social Studies. For English grades, there was a significant positive gain for those students involved in group counseling. This is an important finding because in 1974-75 there was no reliable differentiation between group counseling and the program alone students in any of the four curriculum areas. The difference in change scores between group counseling and control students in English was a full half grade. Even this gain is depressed by the inclusion of Yale which showed a net loss for group counseling in English grades. Looking at only Cushing and Ripley, the net gain was nearly 3/4 of a grade increase. Therefore, group counseling for students who are seen as in need of these services leads to a reliable increment in their English grades relative to a control condition.

In the other three curriculum areas, there was no reliable difference between the two conditions. Overall, group counseling led to a quarter of a grade net gain over the control condition.

Summarizing the findings from the two cognitive domain measures examined for group counseling effects, English grades showed a strong reliable gain for group counseling students. However, no other curriculum areas showed any difference between group counseling and control. On the WRAT, no differences were found in change scores between group counseling and control students. One might interpret this set of findings as showing primarily a motivational effect on these cognitive domain measures. Grades are viewed as a more global index of cognitive functioning than achievement scores. Being more global means more susceptible to other non-cognitive factors, such as motivation. Therefore, group counseling might have aided the students' motivational disposition to achieve in school. If this motivational hypothesis is correct, the group counseling students should show greater gains on the SSHA, which will be presented in the next subsection.

TABLE 27

GRADE CHANGE SCORES* BY TOWN
GROUP COUNSELING - CONTROL

Curriculum Area	Town	Change Scores: Group Counseling	n-	Control	n	Difference
ENGLISH	Cushing	+.84	7	+.12	16	+ .72
	Ripley	+.93	7	+.23	16	+ .70
	Yale	+.22	5	+.53	15	- .31
	Total	+.79	17	+.29	47	+ .50
		t(62df) = +2.07, p < .05				
MATH	Cushing	+.98	7	+.17	13	+ .81
	Ripley	0	7	+.07	6	- .07
	Yale	-	0	-	-	-
	Total	+.49	14	+.14	19	+ .35
		t(31df) = +1.17, ns				
SCIENCE	Cushing	+.50	7	+.34	4	+ .16
	Ripley	-.75	7	+.71	8	-1.46
	Yale	+.48	5	+.06	12	+ .42
	Total	+.03	19	+.32	24	- .29
		t(41df) = -0.88, ns				
SOCIAL STUDIES	Cushing	+.50	7	+.52	11	- .02
	Ripley	+.21	7	+.31	10	- .10
	Yale	+.17	3	+.54	9	- .37
	Total	+.32	17	+.46	30	- .14
		t(45df) = -0.73, ns				
OVERALL	Cushing	+.71	28	+.25	44	+ .46
	Ripley	+.10	28	+.32	40	- .22
	Yale	+.31	13	+.37	36	- .06
	Total	+.55	69	+.31	120	+ .24

*All grades are based on 4.0 system. Drumright did not report grades.

Affective Domain:

Only students new to the program received the affective testing battery. Since both new and previously placed students were involved in the group counseling, the number of students who fit both criteria will constitute the sample of group counseling for these affective domain measures. The result of this is that data analyses took place on a much reduced number than was presented in the previous section. Also the control group here represents only students who were new to the program, were enrolled in the four older resource rooms where group counseling took place, but were not referred for group counseling. By town, this resulted in the followimg composition of the group counseling and control samples on these affective measures. Cushing had 3 students in the group counseling sample and 6 students in the control sample. Drumright had 3 students in the group counseling sample and 5 students in the control sample. Ripley had 3 students in the group counseling sample and 3 students in the control sample. Yale had 1 student in the group counseling sample and 4 students in the control sample. Therefore, the maximum n on any affective measure for group counseling was 10, for control sample was 18. In the tables to follow, no differentiation will be made by town because of the small number of students in either group for each individual town.

Table 28 shows the pre, post and change scores on the seven scales of the SSHA. Also listed are the results of the set of t test for independent samples performed on this data.

Work Methods, Teacher Approval, Education Acceptance, Study Attitudes and Study Orientation all showed significant gains made by the group counseling students in relation to the control student. In general, the students involved in group counseling seemed to receive a motivational boost, especially in their study attitudes. This matches the motivational hypothesis for the significant grade gains in English that was put forth in the previous section.

Also it can readily be seen that those students referred for group counseling had a much lower profile on the SSHA than did the control students.

TABLE 28

SURVEY OF STUDY HABITS AND ATTITUDES PERCENTILE SCORES:
GROUP COUNSELING - CONTROL

Scale		Group Counseling	n	Control	n	Difference
Delay Avoidance	Pre	19.40	10	29.16	18	
	Post	19.98		26.32		
	Change	+0.58		-2.84		+3.42
		t(26df) = 0.55, ns				
Work Methods	Pre	14.50		26.29		
	Post	26.49		23.92		
	Change	+11.99		-3.07		+15.06
		t(26df) = 2.26, $p < .05$				
Study Habits	Pre	12.38		26.84		
	Post	19.48		22.64		
	Change	+7.10		-4.20		+11.30
		t(26df) = 1.92, ns				
Teacher Approval	Pre	9.69		27.62		
	Post	24.01		26.26		
	Change	+14.32		-1.36		+15.68
		t(26df) = 2.85, $p < .01$				
Education Acceptance	Pre	11.20		28.61		
	Post	20.03		21.67		
	Change	+8.83		-6.94		+15.77
		t(26df) = 2.35, $p < .05$				
Study Attitudes	Pre	7.51		26.07		
	Post	20.51		25.21		
	Change	+13.0		-0.86		+13.86
		t(26df) = 3.01, $p < .01$				
Study Orientation	Pre	6.81		24.16		
	Post	17.29		20.95		
	Change	+10.48		-3.21		+13.69
		t(26df) = 2.74, $p < .02$				

Table 29 shows the pre, post and change scores for the 6 scales of the FIRO-F. Table 30 shows the pre, post and change scores for the 6 scales of the FIRO-B. Also listed on these two tables are the results of two sets of t tests for independent samples between the group counseling and the control samples. On the FIRO-F, the two Affection scales showed a significant difference between the group counseling and control samples. Group counseling led to reliable gains in both wanted and expressed warmth. Therefore on the feeling level, group counseling produced an increased degree of interpersonal warmth. On the FIRO-B (Table 30) which taps the behavioral level of interpersonal stance, the wanted control scale showed a significant difference between the two groups. Group counseling led to a significant reduction in the degree of wanted control. In other words, group counseling produced a reliable change in interpersonal stance that indicates a greater degree of behavioral independence.

From Tables 29 and 30, one can inspect the FIRO profiles for the group counseling students and the control students. Unless there are at least two points between respective pre-test scales for different groups, no meaningful difference can be ascribed between the groups. The FIRO is scaled such that scores of 0, 1 and 2 are excessively low scores; 3-6 are moderate scores; and 7-9 are excessively high scores on the scale. There is no greater difference than 1.0 points between the groups on the pre-test profile. Therefore one can collapse across both groups to describe the FIRO profile of the secondary L. D. student with the Oklahoma Child Service Demonstration Center project.

At the feeling level on the Inclusion dimension, while the student desires a moderate amount of social interaction, his feelings of expressing this sociable attitude seem inhibited. The L. D. student also takes a relatively submissive stance in his interpersonal feelings; he feels more dependent on others than independent. Also he feels

TABLE 29

FIRO-F SCORES:
GROUP COUNSELING - CONTROL

Scale		Group Counseling	n	Control	n	Difference
Expressed Inclusion	Pre	1.45	9	2.38	18	
	Post	3.33		4.24		
	Change	+1.88		+1.86		+.02
		t(25df) = +.032, ns				
Wanted Inclusion	Pre	4.22		4.80		
	Post	4.67		4.98		
	Change	+0.45		+0.18		+.27
		t(25df) = +.39, ns				
Expressed Control	Pre	2.00		2.39		
	Post	2.22		2.20		
	Change	+0.22		-0.19		+.41
		t(25df) = +.84, ns				
Wanted Control	Pre	3.44		3.92		
	Post	2.67		3.88		
	Change	-0.77		-0.04		-.73
		t(25df) = -1.29, ns				
Expressed Affection	Pre	3.11		3.37		
	Post	3.78		2.76		
	Change	+0.67		-0.61		+1.28
		t(25df) = 2.11, $p < .05$				
Wanted Affection	Pre	4.44		5.44		
	Post	5.00		4.54		
	Change	+0.56		-0.90		+1.46
		t(25df) = 2.34, $p < .05$				

TABLE 30

FIRO-B SCORES:
GROUP COUNSELING - CONTROL

Scale		Group Counseling	n-	Control	n	Difference
Expressed Inclusion	Pre	3.33	9	4.1?	18	
	Post	3.44		3.76		
	Change	+0.11		-0.43		+ .54
		t(25df) = +.83, ns				
Wanted Inclusion	Pre	2.34		3.20		
	Post	2.45		3.81		
	Change	+0.11		+0.61		- .50
		t(25df) = -.72, ns				
Expressed Control	Pre	1.78		2.13		
	Post	1.78		2.74		
	Change	0		+0.61		- .61
		t(25df) = -.93, ns				
Wanted Control	Pre	3.55		3.22		
	Post	2.11		3.08		
	Change	-1.44		-0.14		-1.30
		t(25df) = -2.34, p< .05				
Expressed Affection	Pre	2.11		2.96		
	Post	2.56		3.06		
	Change	+0.43		+0.10		+0.35
		t(25df) = +.57, ns				
Wanted Affection	Pre	2.22		2.89		
	Post	2.67		3.02		
	Change	+0.45		+0.13		+0.32
		t(25df) = +.59, ns				

little conflict on his Affection dimension. He feels like he wants and expresses a moderate amount of warmth towards others.

At the behavioral level, the L. D. student describes himself as behaving socially at a low moderate level. His behavior shows a tendency towards the introverted end; however, no inhibition appears in the Inclusion dimension on the behavioral level, as it did on the feeling level. The behavioral repertoire of interpersonal control is similar to his feelings. He behaves in a relatively submissive manner; he also could be seen as a rebel who doesn't expect to lead, but also doesn't expect to follow. Also at the behavioral level of affection, there is no discrepancy between what he expresses and what he desires. However, his behavioral repertoire of interpersonally warm behaviors seems deficient given his feelings.

In a nutshell, while the L. D. student is feeling inhibited in being sociable, relatively submissive and moderately warm towards others, his actions are introverted, rebellious and distant. The strong discrepancy between his feelings and behavior are in the affectionate area.

Table 31 depicts the pre, post and change scores for the following measures on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale for the group counseling and control samples: Total Conflict, Total Esteem, Identity Esteem, Self Acceptance, Behavior Esteem, Area Variability, Physical Esteem, Moral Esteem, Personal Esteem, Family Esteem, Social Esteem and Dimension Variability. A set of t tests for independent samples were performed on these 12 measures' change scores for the two samples. Only one difference was found to be significant. Identity Esteem was found to be reliably improved by group counseling. Therefore group counseling did lead to a significant gain on one dimension of self esteem - one's sense of identity.

From Table 31, one can inspect the pre-test scores for the two samples. While group counseling students did characteristically show a lower pattern of scores, indicating general lower self esteem,

TABLE 31a

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE SCORES:
GROUP COUNSELING - CONTROL

Scale		Condition				
		Group Counseling	n	Control	n	Difference
Total Conflict	Pre	43.11	10	36.58	17	
	Post	40.48		36.01		
	Change	-2.63		-0.57		-2.06
Total Esteem	Pre	280.29		299.15		
	Post	290.22		303.84		
	Change	+9.93		+4.69		+5.24
Identity Esteem	Pre	100.53		111.89		
	Post	109.60		112.81		
	Change	+9.07		+0.92		+8.15*
Self Acceptance	Pre	86.49		94.49		
	Post	89.57		93.91		
	Change	+3.08		-0.58		+3.66
Behavior Esteem	Pre	93.27		92.72		
	Post	90.99		97.16		
	Change	-2.28		+4.44		-6.72
Area Variability	Pre	26.49		31.34		
	Post	30.90		29.38		
	Change	+4.41		-1.96		+6.37

*Significant at $p < .05$, $t(25df) = 2.43$

TABLE 31b

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE SCORES:
GROUP COUNSELING - CONTROL

Scale		Condition				
		Group Counseling	n	Control	n	Difference
Physical Esteem	Pre	57.19	10	61.86	17	
	Post	58.53		62.59		
	Change	+1.34		+0.73		+0.61
Moral Esteem	Pre	54.58		57.05		
	Post	56.21		59.47		
	Change	+1.63		+2.42		-0.79
Personal Esteem	Pre	56.00		59.65		
	Post	57.92		59.61		
	Change	+1.92		-0.04		+1.96
Family Esteem	Pre	59.50		63.07		
	Post	58.70		61.73		
	Change	-0.80		-1.34		+0.54
Social Esteem	Pre	53.02		57.48		
	Post	58.89		61.26		
	Change	+5.87		+3.78		+2.09
Dimension Variability	Pre	20.31		19.85		
	Post	20.91		25.95		
	Change	+0.60		+6.10		-5.50

the differences were all less than 10 T score points. Therefore, one cannot view these profiles as reliably different for these two samples. Collapsing across these nonsignificant scale differences, one can describe the TSCS profile of the Oklahoma Child Service Demonstration Center student in the following fashion.

The L. D. adolescent shows a moderately high degree of conflict concerning his self esteem. His total self esteem is low, at about the 5th percentile of the test norms. His esteem for his own identity and his own behavior is even slightly lower than this, at about the 3rd percentile. These three measures are all meaningfully deficient from the norm. Only on the dimension of self-acceptance does his esteem fall within normal limits, although this score is moderately depressed - approximately the 20th percentile. Among the five areas of self esteem, his view of his body, his morals and his social self are all significantly depressed - all around the 5th percentile. His view of himself as an individual person and as a family member fells within normal limits - again around the 20th percentile.

The above profile matches in all respects the profile of the L. D. students within the program during the 1974-75 year with the exception that this year's profile was slightly more depressed.

To summarize the findings of the effects of group counseling on the affective measures, group counseling led to reliable gains in work methods and study attitudes; this was probably due to a motivational boost given students by group counseling. In the area of interpersonal stance, the student in counseling groups increased in their feelings of warmth for others; more independent interpersonal behavior was another reliable finding. Finally, group counseling led to a gain in feeling of esteem for the student's self identity. All in all, the group counseling experience was a fruitful endeavor for these students in their development towards greater independence and warmth, a firmer sense of self and stronger academic motivation.

Rated Improvement:

Table 32 shows the mean ratings of improvement for the resource room teachers, students and parents for the group counseling and control samples. These data are presented descriptively. The difference score column shows that both resource room teachers and students rate improvement to be greater for those students in group counseling. The parents rated the control students higher than the group counseling sample. However, the group counseling sample is rated at a 3.05 level which is higher than the scores given them by the teachers and students. Since the parents have characteristically overrated change in relation to the other two sets of raters, one might speculate that a halo effect works stronger in this set of rates. Possibly parents do not note change as readily as do the students themselves or their resource room teachers.

Overall the group counseling students were rated as having improved to a moderate extent which bettered the degree of improvement found for the control sample.

Conclusion:

Group counseling aids students academically by motivating them to consider themselves and their academic world in a different perspective. It aids their increasing maturity, and consequently provides positive ramifications in the cognitive and affective domain, as well as in the eyes of others.

TABLE 32

RATINGS OF IMPROVEMENT:
GROUP COUNSELING - CONTROL

Scale	Group Counseling	n	Control	n	Difference
Resource Room Teacher		21		52	
Academic	2.57		2.37		+.20
Social-Emotional	2.53		1.99		+.54
Overall	2.55		2.18		+.37
Student Self Rating		21		55	
	3.17		2.95		+.22
Parents Questionnaire		16		39	
	3.05		3.40		-.35

All table entries on 4.0 system.
0 = worse; 1 = no change; 2 = mild improvement; 3 = moderate improvement;
4 = great improvement.

STUDENT SELF-RATING QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is intended to find out how you feel you are doing in a variety of things that are important in your school work.

Your answers are considered confidential information to be used as part of a general grading of the Resource Room. Feel free to answer all the questions honestly, because they will not be used to evaluate you, just to evaluate the program.

For each item, two questions will be asked. The first is to find out how good or poor you would rate yourself on the various areas of school work. But answer these questions as if it were when you entered the program. Think back to how you were when you first came into the Resource Room, and answer the first question (a) in each area in this way. Then the second question (b) is your own rating of what sort of change, if any, has taken place from then to now.

Circle the appropriate answer.

1a. Did I like myself?

not at all a little bit very much

1b. Do I like myself now?

less about the same more

2a. Was I able to write down clearly what I had in my mind?

not very well fairly well very well

2b. Has this ability changed?

now worse no change now better

3a. Was I able to say clearly what I had in my mind?

not very well fairly well very well

3b. Has this changed?

now worse no change now better

4a. How much did I read?

nothing a little bit very much

4b. Has this changed?

read less about the same amount read more

5a. How quickly did I read?

slow about average fast

5b. Has this changed?

read more slowly read at the same speed read faster

6a. How was I in Math?

poor	average	good

6b. Has this changed?

now worse	no change	now better

7a. How interested was I in school?

not at all	a little bit	very much

7b. Has this changed?

now less interested	about the same	now more interested

8a. Did I want to be in the Resource Room?

not at all	a little bit	very much

8b. Has this changed?

want to be in the Resource Room less, now	about the same	want to be in the Resource Room more now

9a. How willing was I to do schoolwork?

not at all	a little bit	very much

9b. Has this changed?

less willing now	about the same	more willing now

10a. How was my attendance at school?

poor	average	good

10b. Has this changed?

worse	about the same	better

11a. Did I daydream in school?

not at all	a little bit	very much

11b. Was this changed?

daydream less	about the same	daydream more

12a. Was I restless in school?

not at all	a little bit	very much

12b. Has this changed?

less restless	about the same	more restless

13a. Did I talk in class when I wasn't supposed to?

not at all	a little bit	very much

13b. Has this changed?

talk less now	about the same	talk more now

14a. How mature did I feel?

not very mature	a little mature	very mature

14b. Has this changed?

less mature now	about the same	more mature now

15a. Did I resent being in school?

not at all	a little bit	very much

15b. Has this changed?

resent it less	about the same	resent it more

16a. Did I follow directions?

not at all	fairly well	very well

16b. Has this changed?

follow directions more poorly now	about the same	follow directions better now

17a. Did I fight in school?

not at all	a little bit	very much

17b. Has this changed?

fight less now	about the same	fight more now

18a. Did I do things just to get attention?

not at all	a little bit	very much

18b. Has this changed?

do less attention-getting	about the same	do more attention-getting

19a. Did I brag about myself?

not at all	a little bit	very much

19b. Has this changed?

brag less now	about the same	brag more now

20a. Did I feel lonely in school?

not at all	a little bit	very much

20b. Has this changed?

less lonely now	about the same	more lonely now

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is part of the annual evaluation of the Resource Room in which your child is enrolled. The Resource Room is funded by the Federal Government, which requires an annual evaluation to be considered for future continuation of these special classes.

Please read the instructions below, complete the questionnaire, and return the questionnaire as soon as possible. A stamped, pre-addressed envelope is provided for your convenience.

Thank you for your cooperation,

_____

Resource Room Teacher

Instructions

This questionnaire is intended to find out how you feel your child is doing in a variety of areas that are important in his (her) schoolwork.

Your answers are considered confidential information to be used as part of the general grading of the Learning Disability program here. Feel free to answer the questions honestly, because they will not be used to evaluate your child, just to evaluate the program.

Each question is intended to find out what sort of change, if any, you have noticed in your child during the past school. Circle the appropriate answer.

1. Does your child seem to have changed in the amount of self-respect he has for himself?

   less self-respect now no change more self-respect now don't know

2. Has he (she) changed in the amount of reading he (she) does?

   reads less now no change reads more now don't know

3. Has he (she) changed in his ability to communicate his ideas when he talks?

   now worse no change now better don't know

4. Has he (she) changed in his ability to use numbers?

   poorer now no change better now don't know

5. Has he (she) changed in his interest in school?

   less interest now no change more interest now don't know

6. Has he (she) changed in his interest or curiosity <u>generally</u>?

less now | no change | more now | don't know

7. Has he (she) changed in his willingness to do homework?

less willing now | no change | more willing now | don't know

8. Has he (she) changed in willingness to do chores at home?

less willing now | no change | more willing now | don't know

9. Has he (she) changed in degree of restlessness at home?

less restless now | no change | more restless now | don't know

10. Has he (she) changed in amount of daydreaming at home?

less daydreaming now | no change | more daydreaming now | don't know

11. Has he (she) changed in his respect for your requests?

less respect now | no change | more respect now | don't know

12. Has he (she) changed in how mature he seems to be?

less mature now | no change | more mature now | don't know

13. Has he (she) changed in how much fighting he does around the home?

less fighting | no change | more fighting | don't know

14. Has he (she) changed in how much time he spends all by himself?

less time by himself | no change | more time by himself | don't know

15. Circle the word that comes closest to describing your relationship to your child.

distant | warm | angry

NUMBER OF STUDENTS RECEIVING
DIAGNOSTIC PRESCRIPTIVE SERVICES
JULY 1, 1975 - JUNE 30, 1976

A total of 142 students received diagnostic prescriptive services during the fiscal year of 1975-1976.

All students placed into the model program receive a formally written prescription with re-evaluation and modification being ongoing.

DIAGNOSTIC SCREENING AND TESTING

A vital component of the Oklahoma Child Service Demonstration Center is the diagnostic and screening element. All students referred and subsequently placed in the program are administered an exhaustive battery prior to placement and prescriptive services.

All students placed in the program are also re-evaluated towards the end of the year to assess progress, both in the cognitive and affective areas of development. Table 33 reflects the kind and number of diagnostic instruments used in this battery. A total of 1,576 individual lists were administered during the fiscal year of 1975-76. (See Table 33)

NUMBER OF PARENTS RECEIVING SERVICES
JULY 1, 1975 - JUNE 30, 1976

Parent conferences are an integral part of the model Child Service Demonstration Center project. Total formal parent conferences totalled 69. This figure, however, does not reflect parent-related activities and exposure.

Parents of project students are also members of the Advisory Council Board which meets monthly to evaluate progress and goals of the Child Service Demonstration Center.

A summer tutorial program was initiated by parental request. Students from five of the six school districts were involved in this first time offered service. Weekly parental contact is involved in

TABLE 33

DIAGNOSTIC SCREENING AND TESTING
JULY 1, 1975 - JUNE 30, 1976

Wechsler Scales - (WISC, WISC-R and WAIS)	153
Wide Range Achievement	291
Durrell Reading Analysis - (and other Reading Tests)	86
Keymath Test	33
Bender Gestalt	91
Keystone Telebinocular	34
Peabody Picture Vocabulary	8
Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities	3
Peabody Individual Achievement Test	40
Student Self Rating Questionnaire	108
Incomplete Sentence Test	43
Tennessee Self-Concept	169
FIRO-B (Fundamental Inter-Personal Relations Orientation - Behavior	169
FIRO-F (Fundamental Inter-Personal Relations Orientation - Feelings	174
SSHA (Survey Study Habits and Attitudes)	174
Total Individual Tests Administered	1,576

this service.

A questionnaire was mailed to all parents of project students at the end of the school term of 1975-76 requesting their evaluation of the model program (see Table 25).

The following table reflects parental contact by project staff members.

TABLE 34

PARENTAL CONTACT BY PROJECT STAFF

Formal parent conferences	69
State A.C.L.D. Chapter presentations	210
A.C.L.D. State Convention presentation	150
Resource Room open house for parents of project students	45
National A.C.L.D. Conference presentation, Seattle, Washington	70
Parent conferences - summer tutorial program at project headquarters	32

IN SERVICE TRAINING
JULY 1, 1975 - JUNE 30, 1976

In service training is a vital component of the Oklahoma Title VI-G project. The following quantitative table (Table 35) lists in services presented during the fiscal year. This table includes types of in service, date, title, category and number of participants.

Total number of formal presentations was 25 with a total of 1,324 participants.

TABLE 35

INSERVICE	DATE	PLACE	TITLE OF PRESENTATION	CATEGORY	NO. OF PARTICIPANTS
Public Awareness	8-18-75	Project Headquarters (Cushing)	Overview of Project	Cushing School Board Members, Civic Club Presidents	30
Faculty in-service	8-19-75	Ripley	Procedures, Services, Identification of C.S.D.C.	Administrators and faculty	22
Faculty in-service	8-19-75	Cushing	Procedures, Services, Identification of C.S.D.C.	Administrators and faculty	45
Public awareness	8-19-75	Cushing	Program for Secondary L.D. Direction and Perpectives	Civic Lion's Club Members	85
Faculty in-service	8-20-75	Drumright	Procedures, Services, Identification of C.S.D.C.	Administrators and faculty	20
Faculty in-service	8-22-75	Stroud	Procedures, Services, Identification of C.S.D.C.	Administrators and faculty	32
Faculty in-service	8-25-75	Perkins	Procedures, Services, Identification of C.S.D.C.	Administrators and faculty	23

68

INSERVICE	DATE	PLACE	TITLE OF PRESENTATION	CATEGORY	NO. OF PARTICIPANTS
Creek County Math Teachers	9-29-75	Mannford	Overview of L.D. Center. Activities and prescriptions.	Teacher's meeting	8
Perkins PTA Meeting	10-10-75	Perkins	Overview of L.D. Center. Activities and prescriptions.	High school PTA	75
Cushing Newcomers	10-16-75	Cushing	Overview of program.	Civic Club	25
State ACLD	11-6-75	Tulsa	Secondary L.D. Programming	Organization, Parents and Professionals	150
Maine Educators and Administrators	11-19-75	Maine	Programs for Secondary L.D. Students.	Workshop, Educators	120
O.S.U. Career Development Class	11-19-75	O.S.U., Stillwater	Overview of Program Activities	University	35

60.

INSERVICE	DATE	PLACE	TITLE OF PRESENTATION	CATEGORY	NO. OF PARTICIPANTS
Secondary L.D. Workshop, State RESC personnel	Jan. 29, 30 1976	Cushing	Secondary L.D. program: Diagnostic assessment, prescriptive services, Resource Room and theoretical approaches.	State RESC personnel, L.D. teachers, H. S. administrators	50
RU Legislative workshop	2-6-76	Tulsa	To promote funding for secondary L.D. classrooms	L.D. Teachers -Legislators Administrators	75
Tulsa County Vocational-Tech school, L.D. Adv. Comm.	2-10-76 2-24-76 3-15-76	Tulsa	Chairman of Vo-Tech Advisory Committee for the development of an exemplary L. D. lab.	Administrators College Educ. A.C.L.D. Pres.	14
National ACLD Convention	March 2-5, 1976	Seattle, Wash.	Overview of a 2 year study of secondary L.D. classroom.	L.D. teachers Administrators Parents	135
National ACLD convention	March 2-5, 1976	Seattle, Wash.	Comparative Effects of Alpha and Beta EEG Biofeedback Training on Achievement and Affective Measures in the Learning Disabled Adolescent	L.D. Teachers Administrators Parents	60
National ACLD Convention	March 2-5, 1976	Seattle, Wash.	Group Counseling for the Learning Disability Student	L.D. Teachers Administrators Parents	70

INSERVICE	DATE	PLACE	TITLE OF PRESENTATION	CATEGORY	NO. OF PARTICIPANTS
Tulsa County Vocational L. D. Advisory Council	3-15-76	Tulsa	Overview of Model Secondary L.D. program	L. D. Teachers Administrator Vocational Instructors	15
Tulsa ACLD Chapter	4- 5-76	Tulsa	Replication and Overview	Parents L. D. Teachers Administrators	80
Enid ACLD & Regional Education Service Center	4-13-76	Enid	Replication and Overview	Parents L. D. Teachers Administrators	50
Putnam City (Okla. City) ACLD Chapter	4-20-76	Okla. City	Replication and Overview	Parents L. D. Teachers Administrators	80
Bartlesville Administrators Regional Education Service Center	5-11-76	Bartlesville	Replication and Overview	Administrators L. D. Teachers	10
Tulsa County Vocational L. D. Advisory Council	5-14-76	Tulsa	Consulting on Materials for Secondary L.D.	L. D. Teachers Administrators Vocational Instructors	15

Total number of formal presentations = 25

Total number of participants = 1,324

62.

ON-SITE VISITATIONS TO PROJECT CENTER

The Oklahoma Child Service Demonstration Center welcomes visitors at all times to the project headquarters. Groups and individuals have toured the program continually during the fiscal year of 1975-76. The following Table 36 lists by state and numbers the on-site visitations to the project.

TABLE 36

State	No. of Visits	Participants
Arkansas	4	4
California	1	2
Kansas	1	1
Massachusetts	1	2
Minnesota	1	1
Oklahoma	53	121
Pennsylvania	2	2
Texas	3	5
Total	63	138

NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INVOLVED IN REPLICATION ACTIVITIES

Five school districts replicated the Oklahoma Child Service Demonstration Center model. Three of these five replication sites are metropolitan areas. These cities include Tulsa, Bartlesville, Enid, Cushing and Tecumseh. Four additional sites are currently in the process of replication activities.

The State Department of Education, Special Education Division, received 55 requests for secondary L. D. classes. This is a 67% increase over the previous year.

MATERIAL DISSEMINATION

A major thrust of the Oklahoma Child Service Demonstration Center has been in dissemination efforts. Particular interest has been shown in the Multi-Media Materials Catalogue which was compiled

TABLE 37

MULTI-MEDIA MATERIALS CATALOGUE DISSEMINATION

Formal Inservice Presentation	=	248
Phone Requests	=	25
On Site Visitation (Project Headquarters)	=	50
Project School Districts	=	47
Formal Written Request	=	215
Miscellaneous Request	=	22
Total Catalogue Dissemination (July 1, 1975 through June 30, 1976)	=	607

TABLE 38

July 1, 1975 - June 30, 1976

Total Number of Catalogues Disseminated by written request = 215

Alphabetical listing by State include:

Alabama
Alaska
Arizona - 4
Arkansas - 1
California - 15
Colorado - 8
Connecticut - 1
Delaware
Florida - 2
Georgia - 1
Hawaii
Idaho - 2
Indiana - 2
Illinois - 8
Iowa - 2
Kansas - 1
Kentucky - 2
Louisiana - 3
Maine - 11
Maryland - 3
Massachusetts - 4
Michigan - 3
Minnesota - 13
Mississippi
Missouri - 2
Montana - 3
Nebraska - 1
Nevada - 1
New Hampshire
New Jersey - 1
New Mexico - 2
New York - 5
North Carolina - 4
North Dakota - 1
Ohio - 6
Oklahoma - 54
Oregon - 1
Pennsylvania - 3
Rhode Island
South Carolina - 2
South Dakota - 3
Tennessee
Texas - 7
Utah
Vermont
Virginia - 2
Washington - 15
West Virginia - 1
Wisconsin
Wyoming - 2
Canada - 9
Washington, D. C. - 4

and produced by the staff of the Child Service Demonstration Center. This catalogue is collections of curriculum materials suitable for secondary learning disabilities students.

Table 37 reflects types and numbers of catalogue dissemination activities. A total of 607 catalogues were disseminated during the fiscal year of 1975-76.

Table 38 reflects the number of formal written requests to the project for copies of the Multi-Media Materials Catalogue. A total of 215 formal written requests were received by the project during the fiscal year of 1975-76.

AMOUNT OF STATE FUNDS ALLOCATED FOR LEARNING DISABILITIES PROGRAMS

The Oklahoma Child Service Demonstration Center received $50,000 from the State Department of Education to compliment the Federal funding during the fiscal year July 1, 1975 - June 30, 1976.

AMOUNT OF LOCAL FUNDS ALLOCATED FOR LEARNING DISABILITIES PROGRAMS

The six school districts served by the model Child Service Demonstration Center project have contributed physical facilities, maintenance, utilities, substitute teachers, teacher aides, specially-built fixtures such as individual cubicles, bookshelves, desks, file cabinets and additional multi-media materials. Local school districts have also sponsored the project's resource room teachers' attendance at professional in service conferences. Contributions by local school districts would approximate $30,000.

SPECIAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS JULY 1, 1975 - JUNE 30, 1976

1. The Oklahoma Child Service Demonstration Center was directly responsible for the establishment of a special L. D. class to serve students in the area Vo-Tech school (Central Vo-Tech School, Drumright, Oklahoma.)

2. Project staff members served as educational consultants to

an adult education class in the project area during the summer of 1975. Most of the class participants were identified as being learning disabled adults.

3. The Oklahoma Child Service Demonstration Center staff members conducted a panel discussion at the State A.C.L.D. Convention in Tulsa, Oklahoma, November 1975. The project also sponsored a half-day workshop on Secondary L. D. The other three workshop presentations at this convention were made by persons outside the state of Oklahoma.

4. The Director of the Oklahoma Child Service Demonstration Center was appointed member and chairman of the Tulsa County Area Vocational-Technical School L. D. Advisory Committee. This Committee will formulate goals and objectives for a proposed learning disabilities laboratory with diagnostic, production and media components. This special lab which will serve as a model L. D. classroom for Vocational-Technical schools will officially open in September 1977.

5. Four Regional A.C.L.D. groups requested the Child Service Demonstration Center staff members to present programs at their Spring meetings.

6. A college graduate credit workshop sponsored by Oklahoma State University and the Child Service Demonstration Center was held at the project site in January 1976. Fifty educators and administrators received formal credit for this workshop.

7. Two research papers dealing with project endeavors were presented at the International A.C.L.D. Convention in Seattle, Washington, February 1976.

8. As a direct impact from the Child Service Demonstration Center model, an additional 400 new classes were appropriated by Oklahoma State Legislature for new Special Education classes for the Fall of 1976.

9. A refunding of a Special Vocational Grant by the Program Development Branch of the Oklahoma Vocational Education Department to the Cushing School Districts to serve secondary L. D. students.

This special grant is the only one of its kind in the state of Oklahoma.

10. An additional Secondary L. D. resource room implemented in the Cushing School District with local funds.

11. A specially designed Secondary L. D. resource room in the Cushing School District. This one of a kind resource room was architecturally designed by the project staff members for project students. The resource room was built completely with local funds.

12. Daily requests from across the State, Nation and Canada for information, materials and products of the Oklahoma Child Service Demonstration Center. (See Table 38)

13. A first time offered remedial tutoring program conducted by staff personnel for project students during the summer 1976. This is a direct result of parental involvement in the model program.

14. Visitation to project headquarters by seven states in addition to persons in the state of Oklahoma. (See Table 36)